<u>**REMARKS**</u>

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-22, 24, 26-27, 29-36, 38-39, 41-44, and 46-58 are pending, of which claims 1, 3, 6-7, 10, 12, 18-19, 24, 30, 35, and 50 have been amended to place the application in condition for allowance.

Teleconference with Examiner

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's time for our teleconference on April 07, 2008, and the Examiner's efforts to clarify pending issues to advance prosecution of the subject application. The subject matter of clams 1 and 10 was discussed with respect to the Anick reference. Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended to clarify and/or incorporate claim language to place the claims in condition for allowance over Anick. Specifically, the claims are amended to clarify that a visual query definition <u>includes a visual border</u> to define a Boolean association between shapes that are displayed within the visual border of the visual query definition.

In addition, Fig. 5 of the subject application was discussed and the Examiner indicated that the illustrated configuration of one visual query definition displayed within the visual border of another visual query definition would likely be allowable over Anick. Accordingly, at least claims 6-7, 19, and 35 include subject matter that is allowable.

Independent claims 1, 12, 24, 35, and 50, along with the respective dependent claims, are allowable over the Anick reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn and that the application be allowed. The Examiner reserved the right to further evaluate the references and/or conduct a further search.

Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 7 are objected to for noted informalities (*Office Action* p.2). Appropriate amendments are provided herein:

Claim 3, line 2: "the A visual" is changed to "the visual".

Claim 7, line 7: "the fist set" is changed to "the first set".

35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-22, 24, 26-27, 29-36, 38-39, 41-44, and 46-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,175,814 to Anick *et al.* (hereinafter, "Anick") (*Office Action* p.3). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a visual query system, comprising:

> query criteria of a query expression displayed as shapes that have a semantic relationship which represents logical associations between the query criteria, where a first shape of query criteria is displayed proximate a second shape of query criteria within a visual query definition that includes a visual border to define a Boolean association between the first shape and the second shape that are both displayed within the visual border of the visual query definition; ...

Anick does not show or disclose various feature(s) recited in claim 1, such as "a visual query definition that includes a visual border to define a Boolean association between the first shape and the second shape that are both displayed within the visual border of the visual query definition", as recited in claim 1. The Office cites to Anick at col.6, lines 1-20 and Figs. 2-13 to reject the "visual query definition" recited in claim 1. However, there is no indication of a visual query definition that includes a visual border in Anick.

Anick only describes tiles that each represent a displayed query term, where a tile is a box around a query term (*Anick* col.6, lines 2-8), and that a tile's relative position, horizontal or vertical to other adjacent tiles, corresponds to the terms of a Boolean query (*Anick* col.6, lines 9-16). Anick shows, in Fig. 2 for example, tiles that are each a query term being displayed in a display area (224) that is simply part of the overall screen display (200), and not a "visual query definition", as recited in claim 1.

Anick describes a query reformulation window (220) within the screen display (200) that appears to be the border of the display area (224). However, the query window (220) on the screen display (200) is clearly not a visual query definition "that includes a visual border to define" a Boolean association between shapes that are displayed within the visual query definition, as recited in claim 1. There is no "definition of a Boolean association" based on the query window (220) and Anick only describes that a tile's relative position corresponds to the terms of a Boolean query.

Contrary to the position-based association of the tiles described in Anick (*i.e.*, the association of the tiles are defined by their relative position to each other – not by any border), Applicant claims that a Boolean association between designated shapes is defined by bordering the designated shapes with a visual border of a visual query definition. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Anick for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3-4 and 6-10 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-4 and 6-10 are allowable over Anick and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn. Additionally, some or all of claims 3-4 and 6-10 are allowable over Anick for independent reasons. For example:

Claims 6-7 recite that an "additional visual query definition is displayed within the visual border of the visual query definition." Anick does not show or disclose one visual query definition displayed within the visual border of another visual query definition, as recited in claims 6-7. Additionally, as described above, the Examiner indicates that this subject matter is allowable. Accordingly, claims 6-7 are allowable over Anick for at least the reasons described above and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 10 recites to "display the query result within the visual border of the visual query definition on the user interface". Anick does not show or disclose a query result displayed within a visual border of a visual query definition on a user interface, as recited in claim 10. The Office cites to Anick for a query result shown in Figs. 2-13 (*Office Action* p.6). However, Anick does not display a query result within a visual border of a visual query definition. Anick only shows, in Fig. 2 for example, a "query matches field" (234) that is displayed in a completely separate window (230) from the query window (220) described above in response to the rejection of claim 1. Clearly, Anick does not show a query result that is also displayed within the visual border of a visual query definition, as recited in claim 10.

The Examiner also contends that Anick shows a "query result" in Fig. 2 as the number "15" in the rectangle tile identified by "BACKUP saveset". Applicant disagrees because the number "15" is not a query result, as recited in claim 10. Anick at col.8, lines 6-8 describes the number as "the number of times each term was found in a most recent search of a database is displayed in the lower leftmost corner of each tile." Anick at col.8, lines 20-28 also describes that a phrase may be recognized from terms in a query string, and displayed along with the query terms (along w/ the number of times that the

phrase occurs in a database search). The "number of times that a term is found in a database", as described in Anick, is not the "query result" that is recited in claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable over Anick for at least the reasons described above and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 12, 24, 35, and 50 are also allowable over Anick for at least the reasons described above in response to the rejection of claims 1 and 10. For example:

Claim 12 recites "a visual query definition displayed with a visual border that associates query criteria of a query expression, the query criteria displayed as shapes within the visual border of the visual query definition", and "to display the query result of the query expression within the visual border of the visual query definition". Anick does not show or disclose a visual border of a visual query definition, or that a query result is displayed within a visual border of a visual query definition, as recited in claim 12.

Claim 24 recites "a display attribute of the visual query definition that defines a Boolean association of the query criteria represented by the shapes displayed within the visual border of the visual query definition", and "a query result displayed within the visual border of the visual query definition". There is no indication of a visual border of a visual query definition in Anick, or that query criteria and a query result is displayed within a visual border of a visual query definition, as recited in claim 24.

Claim 35 recites displaying query criteria within a visual border of a first visual query definition, and "displaying a query result of the query expression within the visual border of the first visual query definition on the user interface". There is no indication of a visual border of a visual query definition in Anick, or that query criteria and a query result is displayed within a visual border of a visual query definition, as recited in claim 35.

<u>Claim 50</u> recites "a visual query definition to associate query criteria of a query expression, the query criteria displayed as shapes having display relationships within a visual border of the visual query definition", and to "display the query result within the visual border of the visual query definition on a user interface", as recited in claim 50. Anick does not show or disclose any such visual border of a visual query definition, or that a query result is displayed within a visual border of a visual query definition, as recited in claim 50.

Accordingly, independent claims 12, 24, 35, and 50 are allowable over Anick for at least the reasons described above and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims: claims 13-14 and 16-22 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 12; claims 26-27 and 29-34 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 24; claims 36, 38-39, 41-44, and 46-49 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 35; and claims 51-58 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 50. Accordingly, the respective dependent claims are allowable over Anick and the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12-14, 16-22, 24, 26-27, 29-36, 38-39, 41-44, and 46-58 are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: __Apr. 14, 2008__   By: / Dave Morasch 42905 /
                                        David A. Morasch
                                        SBMC, p.s.
                                        Reg. No. 42,905
                                        (509) 755-7250